Attorney's Docket No. <u>015290-546</u>



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ENT & TRACES				01102			
In re Patent Ap	oplication of)					
David J. COOPERBERG et al.		Group Art Unit: 176	53				
Application No.: 10/024,208		Examiner: L. L. Al	ejandro Mulero				
Filed: December 21, 2001		Confirmation No.: 9	9076				
)))	SURE STATEMENT L LETTER	RECEIVED JUN 2 5 2003 GROUP 1700			
Commissioner P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, V)						
Sir:							
	ed is an Information Disc d patent application.	closure Staten	nent and accompanying	form PTO-1449 for the			
[X]	No additional fee for submission of an IDS is required.						
[]	The fee of \$180.00 (1806) as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(p) is also enclosed.						
[]	A statement under 37 C.F.R. § 1.97(e) is also enclosed.						
[]	A statement under 37 C.F.R. § 1.97(e), and the fee of \$180.00 (1806) as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(p) are also enclosed.						
[]	Charge \$	to Deposit A	ccount No. 02-4800 for	the fee due.			
[]	A check in the amount of	of \$	is enclosed for the fe	e due.			
1.17 and 1.21	irector is hereby authoriz that may be required by to 2-4800. This paper is su	this paper, an	d to credit any overpays				
		Respectfully	submitted,				
		BURNS, DOA	ne, Swecker & Mathi	is, L.L.P.			
Date: June 23, 2003 By: Peter k Registr		Skiff ation No. 31,917					

P.O. Box 1404 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404 (703) 836-6620

Patent

Attorney's Docket No. <u>015290-546</u>

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of

David J. COOPERBERG et al.

Application No.: 10/024,208

Filed: December 21, 2001

For: TUNABLE MULTI-ZONE GAS INJECTION SYSTEM

Group Art Unit: 1763

Examiner: L. L. Alejandro Mulero

Confirmation No.: 9076

RECEIVED

JUN 2 5 2003

GROUP 1700

THIRD

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

JUN 2 3 2003

In accordance with the duty of disclosure as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.56, Applicants hereby submit a copy of the Written Opinion dated May 30, 2003 for a corresponding application. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.98, a copy of each of the documents not previously cited is enclosed.

Written Opinion for PCT/US02/32057 dated May 30, 2003.

I, the undersigned, hereby state that each item of information contained in this Information Disclosure Statement was cited in a communication from a foreign patent office in a counterpart application and that this communication was not received by any individual designated in § 1.56(c) more than 30 (thirty) days prior to the filing of this Information Disclosure Statement.

To assist the Examiner, the document is listed on the attached form PTO-1449. It is respectfully requested that an Examiner initialed copy of this form be returned to the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: June 23, 2003

By: YEU

Registration No. 31, 917

P.O. Box 1404

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404

(703) 836-6620

JWP/PKS

From the INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

To:

PETERSON, James, W. Burns Doane Swecker & Mathis, LLP P.O. Box 1404 Alexandria, VA 22313-1404 ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE

WRITTEN OPINION

(PCT Rule 66)

		Date of mailing (day/month/year)	30/05/200	03					
Applicant's or agent's file reference 015290-641	REPLY DUE within 2 / 00 months/days from the above date of mailing								
nternational application No. International filing date		(day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year)						
PCT/US 02/32057 V 09/10/2002			15/10/2001						
International Patent Classification (IPC) or	both national classificati	on and IPC							
	H01J37/32	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							
Applicant LAM RESEARCH CORPORATI	ON et al.								
1. This written opinion is the first drawn to	up by this International I	Preliminary Examining	Authority.						
2. This opinion contains indications relatir	ng to the following items:								
I X Basis of the opinion									
II Priority									
III Non-establishment of opin	ion with regard to novelt	y, inventive step and in	dustrial applicability	,					
IV Lack of unity of invention									
V \overline{X} Reasoned statement under citations and explanations			e step or industrial a	applicability;					
VI Certain documents cited									
VII Certain defects in the international application									
VIII Certain observations on the international application									
 3. The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion. When? See the time limit indicated above. The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension, see Rule 66.2(d). How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9. 									
Also For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4. For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4bis. For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6.									
If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.									
4. The final date by which the internationa examination report must be established		s:15/ <u>0</u> 2	/2004	NSCHES PAT					
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/		Authorized officer		(4) O	The state of the s				

Form PCT/IPEA/408 (cover sheet) (march 2002)

D-80298 Munich Tel. (+ 49-89) 2399-0, Tx: 523656 epmu d Fax: (+ 49-89) 2399-4465

European Patent Office

(incl. extension of time limits) Tel. (+49-89) 2399 2828 esp. to 600 due 7/30/03

Examiner

Formalities officer

WRITTEN OPINION

- I. Basis of the opinion
- 1. The basis of this written opinion is the application as originally filed.
- V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability
- 1. In light of the documents cited in the international search report, it is considered that the invention as defined in at least some of the claims does not appear to meet the criteria mentioned in Article 33(1) PCT, i.e. does not appear to be novel and/or to involve an inventive step (see international search report, in particular the documents cited X and/or Y and corresponding claims references).
- 2. If amendments are filed, the applicant should comply with the requirements of Rule 66.8 PCT and indicate the basis of the amendments in the documents of the application as originally filed (Article 34 (2) (b) PCT) otherwise these amendments may not be taken into consideration for the establishment of the international preliminary examination report. The attention of the applicant is drawn to the fact that if the application contains an unnecessary plurality of independent claims, no examination of any of the claims will be carried out.
- NB: Should the applicant decide to request detailed substantive examination, then an international preliminary examination report will normally be established directly. Exceptionally the examiner may draw up a second written opinion, should this be explicitly requested.